



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/596,629	06/19/2000	Connie L. Chapman	FE0040355504	4379

27975 7590 01/15/2004

ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST P.A.  
1401 CITRUS CENTER 255 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE  
P.O. BOX 3791  
ORLANDO, FL 32802-3791

EXAMINER

BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/596,629

Applicant(s)

CHAPMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas B Blair

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Claims 1-70 are currently pending in the application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,377,355 to Hager et al..
4. Hager teaches the invention substantially as claimed including an intranet for distributing an invention disclosure, the intranet having a plurality of users enrolled therein, each of the plurality of users having associated personnel information stored within the intranet (col. 5, lines 1-15), the intranet comprising: a first software module for creating and submitting an invention disclosure over the intranet, the invention disclosure being submitted by an inventor (col. 4, lines 40-61); a second software module for creating a profile of the invention disclosure based upon a technical area relating to the invention disclosure in response to accessing associated personnel information of the inventor (col. 4, lines 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-15); a third software module for transmitting first notification message via e-mail to a first group of users based upon the created profile, the first group of users being within the plurality of users (col. 4, lines 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-15); a fourth software module for transmitting a second notification message via e-

Art Unit: 2142

mail to a second group of users based upon the created profile, the second group of user being within the plurality of users and including a technical review coordinator (col. 6, lines 17-34); a fifth software module for selecting at least one evaluator by the technical review coordinator (col. 9, lines 66-68 and col. 10, lines 1-9); a sixth software module for transmitting a third notification message via e-mail to the at least one evaluator (col. 6, lines 17-34); a seventh software module for submitting evaluation comments by the at least one evaluator (col. 7, lines 5-42); an eighth software module for submitting a recommendation of the invention disclosure by the technical review coordinator based upon the evaluation comments (col. 9, lines 37-57); and a ninth software module for transmitting the recommendation of the invention disclosure via e-mail to the first and second group of users (col. 10, lines 29-58); however Hager does not teach e-mailing a hyperlink to the document.

Official notice is taken that it was well known in the art at the time of the invention to send a hyperlink to a document instead of an entire document.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hager regarding a system for distributing an invention disclosure with the idea of sending a hyperlink instead of an entire document because sending only a hyperlink reduces the size of e-mails that would be sent, thus reducing network traffic.

5. As to claims 53, Hager teaches an intranet wherein the third software module for transmitting the first notification message is responsive to submission of the invention disclosure (col. 4, lines 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-15).

Art Unit: 2142

6. As to claim 54, Hager teaches an intranet wherein the fourth software module for transmitting the second notification message is responsive to submission of the invention disclosure (col. 6, lines 17-34).

7. As to claim 55, Hager teaches an intranet wherein the profile comprises a functional manager of the inventor, a patent attorney, and technical review person (col. 5, lines 33-41).

8. As to claim 56, Hager teaches a profile comprising information relating to the inventor including the inventor's employee number, department number, building number, phone number and e-mail address (col. 4, lines 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-15).

9. As to claim 57, Hager teaches an intranet wherein the first group of user comprises a business area manager, a supervisor of the inventor, and the inventor (col. 4, lines 62-67 and col. 5, lines 1-15).

10. As to claim 58, Hager teaches an intranet wherein the second group of users comprises a technical review coordinator, a contract administrator if the invention was developed under government funds, and an intellectual property administrator (col. 7, lines 32-42).

11. As to claim 59, Hager teaches a software module for creating an invention disclosure further comprising instructions for including an attachment (col. 4, lines 40-61).

12. As to claim 60, Hager teaches a software module for creating an invention disclosure comprising instructions for sending a notification message to a co-inventor (col. 4, lines 40-61). For reasons discussed above it would have been obvious to include a hyperlink in this message.

13. As to claims 1-11, they feature the same limitations as claims 52-60 and are thus rejected on the same basis as claims 52-60.

Art Unit: 2142

14. As to claims 12-21, they feature the same limitations as claims 52-60 and are thus rejected on the same basis as claims 52-60.

15. As to claims 22-30, they feature the same limitations as claims 52-60 and are thus rejected on the same basis as claims 52-60.

16. As to claims 31-41, they feature the same limitations as claims 52-60 and are thus rejected on the same basis as claims 52-60.

17. As to claims 42-51, they feature the same limitations as claims 52-60 and are thus rejected on the same basis as claims 52-60.

18. As to claims 61-70, they feature the same limitations as claims 52-60 and are thus rejected on the same basis as claims 52-60.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

19. Applicant's arguments filed 1/2/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues the following points: a) It would not been obvious to include a hyperlink to the invention disclosure in Hager et al. when submitted to an evaluator via email; (b) Hager et al. teaches away from hyperlinks because the disclosed system is not web based, and consequently each evaluator receives the actual invention disclosure instead of a hyperlink to the invention disclosure; (c) There is not proper motivation for combining Hager et al. with the Official Notice taken by the examiner; and (d) There is no mention in Hager et al. regarding attachments being included with the invention disclosure.

20. As to point (a), the international application entitled "Processing Messages Which Include and Address to Further Information" would have made it obvious at the time of the

Art Unit: 2142

applicant's invention to use emails with hyperlinks instead of sending an entire document via email. US. Patent Number 5,790,790 to Smith et al. also shows this feature.

21. As to point (b), the invention of Hager et al. dates back to September 10, 1990, before the use of web browsers. Hager et al. does not teach away from the use of web browsers because web browsers had not been invented yet at the time of the Hager invention. To put the Hager invention in the context of the international application entitled "Processing Messages Which Include and Address to Further Information" would have made it obvious at the time of the invention to create a web based implementation of Hager's invention.

22. As to point (c), It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hager regarding a system for distributing an invention disclosure with the idea of sending a hyperlink instead of an entire document because sending only a hyperlink reduces the size of e-mails that would be sent, thus reducing network traffic.

23. As to point (d), the revisions discussed in the cited portion are considered attachments. There are not specific details in the claims about an attachment. The claims are read in light of the specification but limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.

### *Conclusion*

24. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

Art Unit: 2142

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B Blair whose telephone number is 703-305-5267. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Harvey can be reached on 703-305-9705. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3800.

Douglas Blair  
January 9, 2004

DBB

  
JACK B. HARVEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER